

Murzin and Jansen Reply: In our Letter [1] we describe the observation of oscillatory variations of the Hall (G_{xy}) conductance in view of topological scaling effects giving rise to the quantum Hall effect. Such oscillations are experimentally observed in disordered GaAs layers in the extreme quantum limit of applied magnetic field. They occur in a field range without oscillations of the density of states due to Landau quantization and are, therefore, totally different from the Shubnikov-de Haas oscillations. In a more detailed analysis of the observed oscillations, we have made a quantitative comparison with conceptually different theories based on a phenomenological approach [2] and on a microscopic description [3] of the scaling problem. In a comment [4], Pruisken and Burmistrov question the microscopic justification of the phenomenological approach and the applicability of the microscopic theory to our experimental data.

Certainly, the phenomenological approach [2] is hypothetical and does not have microscopic justification. However, this does not mean that the results of this approach cannot be valid and experimental comparison will be of interest. The phenomenological approach [2] has been developed for macroscopic samples at finite temperatures. Our derived results for the Hall-conductance oscillation amplitudes from the general expressions of the unified scaling theory [2] hold in the limit $\exp(-2\pi G_{xx}) \ll 1$ for the case of small amplitudes of the oscillations of G_{xx} and G_{xy} with respect to both 1 (in units e^2/h) and $G_{xx}^{sm}(T) - G_{xx}^0$, where $G_{xx}^{sm}(T)$ is the smooth part of diagonal conductance and G_{xx}^0 is the bare diagonal conductance. These conditions are valid in our experiments. The oscillations of G_{xy} are quantitatively well described by this theoretical approach.

In our discussion of the "dilute instanton gas" approximation (DIGA) [1] we didn't consider the difference between the macroscopic conductances measured at finite temperature and the ensemble averaged conductances at $T = 0$ used in this microscopic approach [3]. The very large difference (up to 10 times) in the oscillation amplitudes between experiment and theory (extracted from Ref.[3] using the ensemble averaged conductance at $T = 0$) has led us to the conclusion that the DIGA results differ quantitatively from the experimental data. More recently [5], Pruisken and Burmistrov obtained a roughly 5 times smaller topological oscillatory term (presented in the comment) than that derived in Ref.[3] which would

be in line with our conclusion concerning the smallness of the measured amplitude oscillations with respect to the result [3] as known at the moment of publication. Since an explicit computation of the function $f_H(g_0)$ has not been done [4], we cannot give a quantitative comparison of the oscillation amplitudes with our experimental data considering the DIGA approach for the measured conductance.

Note, that in our experiments G_{xx}^{sm} is a logarithmic function of the temperature with the same coefficient close to $1/\pi$ in front of the logarithm for all four samples in the 2D regime ($T < 1$ K). Such behavior is in line with the theory of the quantum corrections due to dominant electron-electron interactions, although for $G_{xx}^{sm} \sim 1$ one would expect higher order contributions beyond the logarithmic temperature dependence. Using Eq.(2) of the β -function [4] for the range of values of our experimental data, the smooth part of the ensemble averaged conductance σ_0 is essentially outside the quantum corrections limit with logarithmic temperature dependence because, for $\sigma_0 \sim 1$, the term $\propto 1/\sigma_0$ becomes comparable with the first constant term in this equation assigning the logarithmic behavior.

S.S. Murzin

*Institute of Solid State Physics RAS, 142432,
Chernogolovka, Moscow District, Russia*

A.G.M. Jansen

Service de Physique Statistique, Magnétisme, et Supraconductivité, Département de Recherche Fondamentale sur la Matière Condensée, CEA-Grenoble, 38054 Grenoble Cedex 9, France

-
- [1] S. S. Murzin, A. G. M. Jansen and I. Claus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 016802 (2004).
 - [2] B. P. Dolan, Nucl. Phys. B **554**[FS], 487 (1999); cond-mat/9809294.
 - [3] A.M.M. Pruisken and M.A. Baranov, Europhys. Lett. **31**, 543 (1995).
 - [4] A. M. M. Pruisken and I. S. Burmistrov, cond-mat/0504763
 - [5] A. M. M. Pruisken and I. S. Burmistrov, cond-mat/0502488.